

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Meaning of ΓΑΡ. By GENEVA MISENER. Chicago dissertation. Privately printed, 1904. Pp. 75.

This monograph was written to prove the thesis that "all of (sic) the meanings of yáp are derivatives, more or less remote, of the reason-idea which it primarily conveyed, and that they may be assigned to the four following categories, (A) causal, (B) explicative, (C) motivating, (D) confirmatory" (p. 12). "Admitting that it is in form derived from γ_{ϵ} and ἄρα," Miss Misener holds that "the time of its formation so antedates literary Greek, that all consciousness of its origin was certainly lost before the time of Homer" (p. 10). Chapters two to five deal respectively with γάρ in declarative sentences, γάρ anticipatory, γάρ in questions, and άλλὰ γάρ. In declarative sentences γάρ is shown to be causal, explicative, motivating, or confirmatory; anticipatory γάρ is catalogued as causal, motivating, or explicative; γάρ in questions is either confirmatory, justifying, motivating, explanatory, or transitional; and the uses of ἀλλὰ γάρ are classed under three heads, the first of which is subdivided into three species, the second into four, and the third into five, the fifth of which latter is again sub-subdivided into (a) and (b), of which (a) by sub-sub-subdivision becames (α') , (β') , (γ') , (δ') .

Truly, an analysis to have pleased the heart of Aristotle! To rest me, I turn to Apollodorus and construct a family-tree of the descendants of $Oi\rho\alpha\nu\delta$ s and $\Gamma\hat{\eta}$. No guilty $\gamma\delta\rho$ can have escaped. Were it not for the footnotes packed with further examples, one might infer that a separate pigeon-hole had been provided for every $\gamma\delta\rho$ in the extant literature. Though evidently much exact thinking has been put into it, yet to me the classification seems often fictitious; the carver not always to have hit the joints. For example, there is surely no organic distinction between $\gamma\delta\rho$ in declarative clauses and $\gamma\delta\rho$ anticipatory; and even Miss Misener herself, in her treatment of confirmatory $\gamma\delta\rho$ in declarative sentences, admits four times over that it "approaches," or "fuses," or "intermingles," or "blends" with the causal $\gamma\delta\rho$ and the explanatory $\gamma\delta\rho$. It is, indeed, a fluid particle, no more to be fenced into garden-plots than water that flows over submerged fields.

It is a pity that the candidate did not use her rich material to prove the antithesis of her thesis, viz., that from corroborative $\gamma\acute{a}\rho$ ("indeed," "in fact") sprang the causal use "for." This would have been in accord with the general history of all logical conjunctions, as $\delta \imath_{\nu}$, $\grave{a}\lambda\lambda \acute{a}$, or the English "indeed" (for which see Murray's Dictionary.) Though I fear the dissertation contributes little to the sum of human knowledge, having to defend the $\mathring{\eta}\tau\tau\omega\nu$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma$ os, yet the sum of the candidate's knowledge has been certainly enlarged, tested, and not found wanting. And her argument for an ellipse in $\grave{a}\lambda\lambda\grave{a}$ $\gamma\acute{a}\rho$ is the clearest I know.